

REMARKS

The applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough examination of the application and requests reexamination and reconsideration of the application in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-4, 7-9, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 1,250,150 to *DuBois*; claims 2, 5-6 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *DuBois*; claims 10 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *DuBois* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,231,700 to *Cutshall*; and claims 12-14 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *DuBois* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,862,521 to *van Marwijk*.

Independent claim 1 of the subject application is directed to a protective glove comprising a glove portion made of mesh material, a wrist portion also made of mesh material, and an elastic element attached to the wrist portion in the form of a coiled spring wider than it is thick to improve comfort.

The Examiner asserts that *DuBois* discloses a protective glove having a glove portion and wrist portion fabricated from a mesh material and an elastic element attached to the wrist portion in the form of a coiled spring is wider than it is thick.

However, the applicant disagrees with the Examiner's assertion that *DuBois* discloses a spring which is wider than it is thick as claimed by the applicant. Spring 7 of *DuBois* is a common helical spring. A helical spring has a width which is equal to the thickness of the spring. Nowhere does *DuBois* disclose, teach or suggest a spring wider than it is thick as claimed by the applicant and shown in Fig. 4 of the subject application.

Accordingly, as *DuBois* fails to disclose, teach or suggest a spring wider than it is thick as claimed by the applicant, independent claims 1, 15, 16 and 17, and dependent claims 2-14 are patentable over *DuBois*, either alone or in combination with the additional references cited by the Examiner.

Additionally, dependent claim 3 of the subject application includes the feature that each coil of the coiled spring extends parallel to the glove portion for the width of the coiled spring and then turns perpendicular to the glove portion for the thickness of the coiled spring. In addition to the failure of *DuBois* to disclose a spring wider than it is thick, *DuBois* also fails to disclose a coiled spring which extends parallel to the glove portion for the width of the coiled spring and then turns perpendicular to the glove portion for the thickness of the coiled spring as claimed by the applicant.

Accordingly, claim 3 is also patentable for this additional reason.

Each of the Examiner's rejections has been addressed or traversed. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

If for any reason this Response is found to be incomplete, or if at any time it appears that a telephone conference with counsel would help advance prosecution, please telephone the undersigned or his associates, collect in Waltham, Massachusetts, at (781) 890-5678.

Respectfully submitted,

Jason D. Shamske
Reg. No. 43,915

WD-134J
JDS/jmc